

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 93-655C
Filed: April 7, 2025

ANAHEIM GARDENS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

ORDER

On March 31, 2025, First-Wave Plaintiffs (“FWPs”) filed a Motion for Leave to File a Reply in Support of their Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s Post-Trial Opinion and Order. (ECF No. 824). FWPs’ Motion is **GRANTED**.

In filing their Reply, due **fourteen (14) days** from the filing of this Order, FWPs **SHALL NOT** introduce new arguments. *See e.g., SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 439 F.3d 1312, 1319 (Fed Cir. 2006); *Goforth v. United States*, 813 F. App’x 604, 606 (Fed. Cir. 2020). The Court is particularly interested in FWPs’ reply to the United States’ argument that the Court should find that any subjective intent to invest based on potential conversion to market-rate rentals in the future was not reasonable. (*See* Def.’s Resp. to Pls.’ Mot. for Reconsideration at 38–40, ECF No. 823).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ David A. Tapp
DAVID A. TAPP, Judge